

MONTHLY NOTES  
OF THE  
**Library Association**  
of the United Kingdom.

---

At the Meeting on Friday, May 7, a paper will be read by Mr. HENRY WILSON, Assistant Librarian, British Museum: "Remarks on Facsimile Reproduction."

---

APRIL MONTHLY MEETING.

THE sixth Monthly Meeting of the third year of the Association was held at the London Institution on Friday, April 2, 1880, at 8 p.m., Professor W. S. JEVONS in the chair.

The minutes of the previous meeting having been read and confirmed, the Chairman called on Mr. B. R. WHEATLEY to read his paper entitled

THOUGHTS ON TITLE-TAKING, TRITE, TRIVIAL, OR TENTATIVE.—No. 1.

MR. WHEATLEY said: The taking of a title appears a very simple work, and some have spoken of it as a mere copying of words within the capacity of everyone. There can be no objection to the copying of an entire title-page for a special bibliography, but the experience of all who have had to do much cataloguing must lead them to avoid the servile repetition of the wording of a title. There is so much introduced for the sake of appearance or for advertisement, so much that we feel can be of no use to the enquirer, that it seems like being imposed upon, to be tied to the necessity of following literally so much useless verbiage; and it becomes a question whether, even in bibliographical works on rare books, it may not be carried to excess, and whether the complete copying of a title-page is not really an unnecessary and fanciful style of work, for which there is no adequate motive. Is not a catalogue of the nature described in the old clever and amusing anagram of the word, "Got as a clue"? and may not the catalogue title, in some, though of course in a very different degree, bear the same relation to its title-page as an index or title-page does to the book? and may it not therefore bear to that title-page some little proportion of the indicial character? Any of the usual plans of dots, lines, &c., to represent elisions, omissions, &c., can be adopted, but a book must not be considered as badly or improperly catalogued because such and such words have been omitted. The

cultivation of our own judgment in making such omissions will be a more useful object for the employment of our critical faculties. A long list of titles illustrating this point might be made. I have made a copy of one of them as an illustration:—

“Speculum Polytechnum Mathematicum novum, | tribus visionibus illustre | quarum extat | Una Funda- | mentalis Aliquot | Numerorum Danielis et Apo- | calypseos naturæ et proprie- | tatis Consignatio | Altera, usus Hactenus | incognitus Instrumenti Danielis Speccellii, ad altitudinum, profun- | ditatum, longitudinum, latitudinumque dimen- | siones, nec non Planimetricas delinationes | accommodatio | Postrema brevis ac luculenta sexies Acuminati Proportionum Circini quibus fructuose iste adhibeatur | enarratio | In omnium Mathesin Adamantium | Emolumentum | prius Germanicè æditum | Authore | Joanne Faulhabero Arithmetico | et Logista Ulmensi ingeniosissimo | Posteriori vero ne tanto aliæ nationes defraudentur bono, Latinè conversum | per | Joannem Remmelinum, Ph. et Med. | Doctorem | Impressum Ulmæ, typis Joannis | Mederi | MDCXII.”

The following entry of the title is such as perhaps would answer all the necessary requirements of an ordinary catalogue:—“Faulhaber (Johannes). Speculum Polytechnum Mathematicum novum tribus visionibus, una: Numerorum Danielis et Apocalypseos naturæ consignatio; altera: usus Instrumenti Danielis Speccellii, ad altitudinum etc. dimensiones accommodatio; postrema: sexies Acuminati Proportionum Circini enarratio; prius Germanicè, Latinè conversum per Joannem Remmelinum. 4to. Ulmæ, 1612.”

The process usually taking place in a library when a book is required does not necessitate the full display of the wording of a title-page; it is the book itself which is wanted, and the shortened form serves this purpose, while the reading of an elaborate title-page can be obtained from the book itself when found. In choosing our omissions, we ought to make a special point of leaving out all that is a mere expansion of words previously used, while we must enter with care all such phrases as show in what the work is otherwise special or peculiar. There are a certain set of phrases which are frequently met with in old books, such as “Whereunto is added a new and very complete treatise on,” “To which is annexed a very particular and instructive account of,” “The whole illustrated with elegant sculptures after the life,” “With a treatise very profitable and necessary for every man, newly and carefully corrected and amended, and also somewhat enlarged in certain places, on.” Most of such pleonastic phrases might be replaced by the preposition “with,” in brackets if preferred. One is sometimes inclined to omit short first words, or such as are redundant or unnecessary to the sense, and also Latin words or phrases at the head of titles of English works, which are simply translations of the English words following them; but I have sometimes had reason to doubt the propriety of the omission, from finding that these words have become in the course of time a portion of the familiar quotation of the book, and, therefore, if they are not inserted, doubts may arise as to identity of edition. This refers to

Latin sentences as well as to single words, among the latter of which may be mentioned such works as: Hodges' *Loimologia*, or *Account of the Plague*; Deane's *Spadaerene Anglica*; Crooke's *Microcosmographia*, &c. Among causes of error in transcription of titles, one sometimes occurs in which the author's name is placed in a position and type totally subsidiary to that of the translator, in order apparently to flatter the vanity of the latter by throwing the name of the author into the greatest possible shade obtainable by small type, while the translator's name appears in letters which, compared with the author's, are like those of the starring actor in theatrical placards. On the bindings of these books and in rapidly compiled catalogues, the translator's name is invariably adopted as that of the author. I may mention an example: "G. L. Bayle's *Researches on Pulmonary Phthisis*, translated by William Barrow. Liverpool, 1815." At first sight the work is invariably supposed to be Barrow's, the name of Bayle being in small old English type, intentionally so printed. In another work the same object is differently achieved. The book is a translation of Davaine's work on Human Entozoa. In the title Davaine's name does not occur, but the pseudo-author acknowledges a partial indebtedness to him in the preface. The work is really an abridged translation of Davaine's treatise, by Abbotts Smith, though ostensibly a work by the latter. I once met with another simple but singular cause of error in title-taking. It was a small 4to volume in Latin, which at first sight I catalogued as by Herman Conringius. The work was "*Twelve Books on the Chief Controversies in the Art of Surgery*," an "*opera posthuma, nunc primum edita*." I was puzzled, however, on turning over the title, to find the dedication signed by the posthumous author, and further, that in the running heading it was stated to be the work of Thomas Fienus. Turning back to the title to endeavour to decipher the mystery, I soon found that the title-page, which was an engraved one, had a square opening in the centre for the reception of the printed title, but not made sufficiently large for the purpose, and the name of Thomas Fienus had been printed into a dark portion of the engraving, and was thus almost entirely obscured to casual observation. While referring to engraved title-pages, I would add that where a work has two title-pages, one printed and the other engraved, the former should always be taken in preference to the pictured form, as the latter frequently has errors in spelling, either of the author's name or of other important words. Indeed, the engravers appear always to have worked independently of the corrector of the press, and to have had a peculiar idiosyncrasy for variety in their spellings.

Difficulties sometimes occur in the use of the article in French names, leading, when an author has also written in Latin with a Latinized name, to the separation of his works, as: Du Moulin and Molinaeus, Descartes and Cartesius, Le Roy and Regius, Le Clerc and Clericus, Joan. de Montereio and Regiomontanus, and many others. The rule (to be again mentioned subsequently) as to the first of two French names in apposition being the one to be

adopted in alphabetical arrangement, and also applicable to the case where the second name is joined to the first by the preposition "de," has to be sometimes broken when familiar or professional parlance has rendered the second name so common and prevailing as to be the only possible one for use. I need not now refer to the hackneyed case of Voltaire, but I may add a few other illustrations of the point, in those of R. J. Croissant de *Garengeot*, Guill. Mauquest de *La Motte*, H. M. Ducrotay de *Blainville*, &c. The above use of names is easily explicable by the universal instinct to shorten all names brought into constant use, the name which rests last upon the ear soon becoming that adopted for usual parlance by the tongue.

The letter O in names of authors is sometimes a trouble from its usual connexion with the ablative case, and we have to be careful when we come upon such names in titles, as "a Philippo Montalto," "auctore Julio Millo," &c., that we do not turn the surnames into *us*, but give them their right nominatives in *o*, as Philippus Montalto, and Julius Millo, which will be found by reference to dedication or preface to be the right forms of their names.

There is a famous little work by Nicolas Stenson on the Muscles and Glands, in which the genitive case of the name becomes the cause of trouble. On the title the wording is "Nicolai Stenonis de Musculis et Glandulis Observationum specimen," and you naturally write on your title slip, "Steno (Nicolaus)," as it is generally catalogued; but on turning to the preface you find it is signed Nicolaus Stenonis. I met it once somewhere in the form of Nicolaus Stenonis fil., which probably explains the matter, and is connected with the fact that in the vernacular the name is Nicolas Stenson.

When any antique or doubtful form of spelling occurs in a modern work, it is as well in copying it *literatim* to add the word [*sic*] in brackets, as you will find the compositor will otherwise not unfrequently correct your supposed error into the most recent and customary form. When the names of two authors occur as partners in a work, we should not, I think, place the Christian name of the second in parenthesis after the surname, as is often done. The object of the parenthesis being merely to show that the Christian name is removed to the second place for the alphabetical arrangement of the surname, but is to be read first, there can be no reason for repeating the operation with the second name. Honorary titles should not on the same principle be included in the parenthesis, as Brown (John, D.D.), as it gives the reading John D.D. Brown. It seems preferable always to write Brown (John) D.D.

With regard to Christian names, many authors invariably sign with initials, and as it is important for the identification of authors, the Christian name must be sought for in a Biographical Dictionary; but where an author has three or four Christian names, and they are given in full in his work, it will generally suffice to give the first in full, and the rest in initials. I refer to such names as Dietrich Wilhelm Heinrich Busch. In objection to the rule for

putting works under the last initial letter of a concealed name, I may mention one instance out of many. In Errard's work on Geometry, published in 1620, we have "reveue par D. H. P. E. M.," which are the initials of "D. Henriom, Professeur ès Mathematiques." Other letters which occur frequently before names create doubts as to their standing for Christian names or not, such as M., F., P., R., D., &c., which often mean only Monsieur, Frater, Pater, Reverendus, or Dominus. You cannot always be guided by the importance given to names by old printers in their use of small or large type; appearance, totally irrespective of meaning or real importance, seeming to be the controlling guide of the arrangement; take as an instance a work by Ferrarius: IOH. BAPTISTÆ | Ferrarii Senensis | FLORA.||.

We want to keep up a casual acquaintance with the Latinized names of towns, for frequently of three names it is excessively difficult to say whether they consist of two Christian names and a surname, or of a Christian name, a surname, and a patronymic, or agnomen from place of birth or residence. Catalogues often contain errors on this point. A careful reference to the characters of the type in which the name is given at the commencement or end of the preface will sometimes relieve our doubts on the subject. Another class of difficult names is when the surname has the appearance of a Christian name, as P. F. Thomas Longueville, which is often erroneously catalogued under Longueville.

It is a great error to invent new works by entering separately portions of title-pages; such tractates should be entered only as part of the general title in which they are found, with cross references from the several names of the authors.

Lines at the commencement of titles should be confined to replacing the repetition of the same author's name. When the same name occurs with different Christian names it should be repeated, as there is a risk, if the lines are continued, of the whole appearing to the eye as the works of the first author named. The repetition of the surname to every work of an author is equally objectionable, as it destroys the possibility of seeing at a glance the extent of each author's works.

With regard to *place of publication* in our titles, no *ibids* should be allowed to works published at the same place except when they are the works of the same author. *Ibids* continued down a page including works of different authors may lead at a future time, when some cutting-up and re-sorting of the catalogue takes place, to an infinity of error as to place of publication.

On the subject of dates, I may mention some varieties which prove difficulties to cataloguers. There is a master-key, which will unlock the mystery of the greater number of them, and this is the simple and common one that all lesser numbers placed before larger ones, or inserted between parts of them, are to be deducted from the larger. In illustration I may mention that I have seen the dates 1609 in the form of MDCVIV, 1599 as MDIC, viz., one less than 1600; and 1698 as MHDCC, or two from 1700. In an old work, "Mare Liberum," date 1609, there is an uncommon use of i in

place of a c, as CIO.IOL.IX.; 1499 appears as MCDXCIX (the 100 being subtracted from the 500), and the same date may be seen as MID. (one from 1500); 1585 appears as CIOXXXCV., the twenty being deducted from the 1600, and 1599 as MDIC. On a different plan from the above I have seen M.VIC.XXI. for 1621. I need hardly add how frequently a tall I at the end of names and dates stands for two ii, as MDLI. for 1552, and ROSTOCHI for Rostochii.

From the subjects of place and date I must return to notice two other difficulties in regard to Christian names. They are, first, their entire omission in many French works, and secondly, their being confounded with surnames in English. There is a constant trouble arising from this omission of Christian names in French works—it is as if the author was considered to be too well known to require such distinctive initials, and, as in many instances this omission can be supplied by a reference to a Biographical Dictionary, their non-use seems to be caused by a national idiosyncrasy opposed to them. In a Medical Directory of the day, out of about 1,800 names of Doctors of Medicine in Paris, only 300 have had their initials prefixed, and this only where there was a necessity for distinguishing between two or more of the same name; and in the French Dictionaries of Medicine still in progress, and in their earlier editions, in the enumeration of contributors a large number have no initial Christian name prefixed. This peculiarity soon strikes the librarian as more particularly occurring in works published since the commencement of the present century, and as among the authors there are a large number who must have been born during the wild and stormy days of the first French Revolutionary period, when the Church was for a time dethroned and its priests scattered abroad, one feels inclined to ask whether a short time did not then occur when no Christian names were given at baptism, and no rationalistic prenomens supplied their place; infants having only sobriquets, nicknames, or terms of affection given them, which could never assume the position of a genuine name given at a public solemnity; and would be likely to be dropped by the one would-be celebrity of his family, when he left his provincial home to enter the Parisian world, in which he was to be known as the sole representative of his family name. Years ago, while thinking over this question, I came across a passage in Victor Hugo's "Les Misérables," Chap. XXVII., which appeared to favour the supposition; it runs thus: "She called herself Fantine, and why Fantine? She was never known by any other name. At the period of her birth the Directory was still in existence. She had no family name as she had no family, and no Christian name as the Church was abolished." May we not consider this a partial cause of the deficiency of Christian names, and one which has had a collateral influence in causing the withholding of the use of them in cases where nevertheless the Biographical Dictionary testifies to their existence?

On the second subject, of double names, there is a distinct opposition in the rules to be followed in English and French title-taking. In French the *first* of two surnames in apposition without the



intervening preposition *de*, whether hyphenated or not, is almost invariably the name to be adopted for alphabetical arrangement, as Boileau-Despréaux, Choiseul Gouffier, Duplessis Mornay, Pigault Lebrun, Rapin Thoyras, Barthélemy St. Hilaire, Geoffroy St. Hilaire, &c., and a strong collateral proof of this rule is that the French, who, more than any other race, are accustomed to consider their own systems applicable to all other countries as well, in the Indexes to the "Comptes Rendus," and "Mémoires" of their Academy, and in other works, invariably take for the alphabet the first of two English names, such as Marshall Hall, Rymer Jones, Burdon Sanderson, &c., which will be found respectively placed under Marshall, Rymer, and Burdon.

In regard to English double names, the first is generally what I must take the liberty of calling for distinction a "sur-Christian name," and thus the second of two apparent surnames is the one to be used for arrangement in the alphabet, and this rule forms one of those which have been lately adopted, for the sake of obtaining uniformity in the indexes of books, by the Index Society, and is one of the rules recommended by the committee of our Association.

It is a singular thing, that contemporaneously with this apparent settlement of the question, there has been a growing inclination to hyphen these two English names, and so to compel the use of the first as the alphabet one.

I do not wish to discuss instances where other names have been assumed on coming into property left with that proviso; the laws of the land will settle that question; but I will describe in detail an imaginary case illustrating the circumstances to which I allude:—

A child has two Christian names given at its baptism, the second of which is the surname of a friend of the family. Take any name you please as that of our family, say "White," the child becoming William Cullen White. In the course of years he becomes a well-known poet, physician, statesman, or what not; he becomes known as Cullen White, gives this additional Christian name in common to all his children, and they carry it on into another generation, the family becoming generally known and spoken of as the Cullen Whites, and they wish to be so known. But the ancestor poet or statesman was known as a White, and our ancestral librarian catalogued his works under White, and we have continued the process. Why cannot his family be known as the Cullen Whites, as Kirke White and Blanco White are known under White, without our having to arrange their name under Cullen?

Names of this double character among the Smiths, Browns, Joneses, &c., are positively legion, and have hitherto been allowed to follow the English rule given above, in peace; but if this hyphening is to be encouraged, and these two names are hereafter required to be alphabetized under the first or second of them at the caprice of the possessor, "confusion worse confounded" will arise in our catalogues; for the matter is fast growing, and printers' compositors are beginning of their own accord to follow in the track marked out, and in their uncertainty are hyphening double names without the slightest authority for so doing.

The object is patent : the desire to add a sounding prænomen to the simplicity of the original surname ; but this has hitherto been considered as achieved without this hyphening, and I think, if the alteration be allowed to exist in Court Guides, Directories, and Professional Lists, we should if possible make a stand, and not let it invade the more systematic entries of our catalogues, but keep to the rule of placing them, as has been customary in English, under the second name, with cross-references in such peculiar cases as seem to require them.

DISCUSSION.—Mr. NICHOLSON, referring to surnames, mentioned the well-known Robert-Houdin, whose true name was Jean Eugène Robert, Houdin being an assumed addition. In Orrinsmith, originally Orrin Smith, the alteration has gone a step further, and the two names have now become one.—Mr. WALFORD, speaking as a literary worker, said that booksellers often abridged titles so that a book could not be recognised.—Prof. JEVONS said that he had met with all these difficulties, and found some of them almost insurmountable. Titles must sometimes be abridged, but we must be careful to avoid inventing new books, and should indicate variations without inserting any words, because the probability is that they will afterwards be copied as part of the title by someone else. Such names as the Abbé Condillac, or Mr. Locke, present little difficulty, but with obscure authors trouble arises. As to M. as indicating either Monsieur or a Christian name, we can do nothing but refer to dictionaries.—Mr. OVERALL remarked that the title often gave no clue to the subject of the book, and additions became necessary.—Prof. JEVONS said that there were two kinds of catalogues, one a record, the other a finding list.—Mr. WALFORD mentioned a catalogue of hereditary English titles since the Conquest, issued by the Index Society ; a most perfect book of its kind, and very useful to cataloguers.—Mr. BRACE exhibited a title slip in which the date 1468 was given as “terseno in anno terdeni iubilei.”—Mr. WHEATLEY, in reply to a remark respecting changes of name, said that he could not help thinking that the son's name should not be separated from his father's, because he chose to add a prefix.

A vote of thanks to Mr. WHEATLEY for his paper was then carried unanimously.

It was proposed by Mr. T. W. SHORE, and seconded by Mr. C. WALFORD : “That this Association do use its influence, through any means open to it, in promoting the formation of a library of ancient parish registers, or transcripts of the same (previous to 1837) under the care of the Registrar General.” After some discussion, the consideration of the resolution was adjourned until the next meeting.

In last number, page 18, line 28, *for* Saddon *read* Seddon ; line 30, *for* Dr. Owen *read* Rev. E. Owen ; line 47, *after* extracts *insert* “from the minute book.”

London: TRÜBNER & CO., Ludgate Hill.

Single Numbers, *Threepence each.* Annual Subscription,  
*post free, 3s. 6d.*